

8/5/2003

Application No. 10/065,042

Reply to Office Action of 05/09/2003

Remarks/Arguments

Drawings

5 **Examiner:**

The drawings in this application are objected to by the Draftsperson as informal. Applicant is required to submit a proposed drawing correction in reply to this Office action. However, formal correction of the noted defects may be deferred until after the examiner has considered the proposed drawing correction.

Response:

As stated above, this response includes replacement drawings to overcome this objection. If the examiner approves of the replacement sheets as correcting the cited informalities, the applicant respectfully requests that the present application be amended with these six attached sheets.

20

Specification

Examiner:

Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any error of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Response:

The applicant respectfully requests replacement of Paragraphs 7, 23, 25, and 26 as stated in the Amendments to the Specification section of this response. Where alterations other than grammatical changes are being made, full support for those changes may be found in the originally

8/5/2003

Application No. 10/065,042

Reply to Office Action of 05/09/2003

filed application. These changes include adding a minus sign in front of appropriate voltages in Paragraphs 7 and 23 and are clearly supported by Fig.2. No new material has been introduced.

5

Claim Rejections, Allowable Subject Matter, New Claims

Examiner:

10 Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamauchi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,063,425).

 Claims 4-11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten
15 in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response:

20 The applicant acknowledges and appreciates the allowance of claims 4-11 if appropriately amended.

 Therefore, without disclaimer of any kind regarding the respective merits of the originally filed claims, claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 5
25 and claim 5 has been cancelled. Additionally, claim 6 has been slightly amended to now depend on the amended claim 1. Because the examiner has stated that this combination would be allowable, the applicant believes that the claim rejection cited by the examiner has been overcome and
30 respectfully requests reconsideration of the amended claim 1 and claims 2-3.

 Additionally, new claims 12-22 have been introduced. New claim 12 is an independent claim comprising the

8/5/2003

Application No. 10/065,042

Reply to Office Action of 05/09/2003

5 limitations of the original claims 1 and 10. No new material has been introduced. Because the examiner has stated that this combination would be allowable, the applicant believes that the new claim 12 may be allowable and respectfully requests consideration of the new claim 12.

10 New claims 13-19 are respective substantial duplications of the originally filed claims 4-9, and 11 and are all dependent upon claim 12. No new material has been introduced. Because the applicant believes that claim 12 will be allowable, consideration of claims 13-19 dependent thereon is respectfully requested.

15 New independent claim 20 comprises much of the structure of the memory cell as found in the originally filed claim 1. The method claimed in the new claim 20 is different and is supported as follows. No new material has been introduced.

20 "establishing a parasitic capacitor of substantially a predetermined capacitance between the storage unit and the control unit through the application of the operational voltage to the control gate to induce the conductive channel," (Paragraph 21 and Fig.5)

25 "the operational voltage being large enough to induce the conductive channel regardless of the value stored on the floating gate;" (Paragraph 24)

and

30 "utilizing the control unit to store volatile data in the established parasitic capacitor." (Paragraph 25)

35 New claims 21-22 are respective substantial duplications of the originally filed claims 5 and 7. No new material has been introduced. Therefore, the applicant respectfully requests consideration of new independent

8/5/2003

Application No. 10/065,042

Reply to Office Action of 05/09/2003

claim 20 and claims 21-22 dependent thereon.

5

Date: 8/5/2003

Winston Hsu

10

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No.41,526

P.O. BOX 508

Merrifield, VA 22116

U.S.A.

e-mail: winstonhsu@naipo.com.tw

15

Attachments

FAX RECEIVED
AUG - 5 2003
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800